



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,998	10/21/1999	DANIEL W. HEPNER	10990763-1	6218

7590

01/07/2004

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
3404 E HARMONY ROAD
P.O. BOX 272400
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528-9599

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/422,998

Applicant(s)

HEPNER ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q PHAM

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-18 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-14, 16-18 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicants amended claims 1, 4 and 7, canceled claim 6 in the amendment filed on 12/17/2003. The pending claims are 1-5, 7-14, 16-18 and 20-22. Applicant's arguments, with respect to claim 13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-18 and 20-22 has been withdrawn.

As stated by applicants on page 2 that claims 4 and 7 would be allowable over the applied art if rewritten in independent form. Examiner respectfully traverses because there was no commitment of allowance during the interview except the reconsideration of the motivation if claims 4 and 7 if rewritten in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2172

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492].

Regarding to claim 1, Miyachi teaches a method for providing notification of a technician remote from a machine of the need for machine assistance (Miyachi, Col. 3, lines 43-57). As shown in FIG. 1 is a LAN 100 includes a file server 120, workstations 150, printers 180 and a Host 110b coupled to one another via network communications lines 160 (Miyachi, Col. 4, line 38-Col. 5, line 8). As shown in FIG. 2 is a data processing system comprising the MFP 110a (multifunction peripheral), and the Host 110b. The Host 110b is responsible for periodically initiating a refresh of a status information database, which is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in the non-volatile rewritable data storage device 240. (Miyachi, Col. 5, line 9-Col. 8, line 67). As shown in FIG. 4 is a process for retrieving status information of a MFP. After the program has been loaded in step 410, the program allows a technician to select a number of MFP status conditions as shown in Tables 1-2, or the entire database to monitor in step 420. In step 425-430, the technician is allowed to designate a notification method and select a number of trigger conditions. Status information is retrieved, and the Host's MFP status database is updated at steps 440-445. If the process is to continue, then the processor 230 analyzes the status information database

Art Unit: 2172

in step 455, and determines if any of the trigger conditions have been met in step 460 (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 35-Col. 10, line 57). As seen, the program as a reporting application received a number of monitoring status conditions and a trigger condition from a technician as a request for notifying the client the condition of an attribute of MFP, in other words, the technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving a request from a client to notify said client of a condition of an attribute of a system; deriving data about said system attribute to determine if said condition exists*. Miyachi further discloses the steps of *receiving by said reporting application actual data from said system* (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 13-21) and *upon determining that said condition exists, notifying the client of the existence of said condition* by initiating a notification in step 465 as indicated in the settings received in step 425 (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 58-65). Miyachi does not explicitly teach the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute*; and *using by said reporting application said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute*. However, as shown in FIG. 4, a technician is allowed to select a number of MFP status conditions to monitor in step 420. Preferably, the technician may be notified of any of the status conditions in Table 1 and Table 2 of Cols. 6-8, and there is an option to provide the entire database. In step 425 the technician is allowed to designate a notification method. This preferably comprises designating the telephone number of the remote monitoring computer 170, but might also include designating a workstation 150 on the LAN 100 to be notified (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 40-Col. 10, line 50). As seen, a request of notifying of a condition of a system attribute as discussed above comprises information specifying the process

Art Unit: 2172

of extracting system attribute from a database, monitoring system for existence of condition of attribute and presenting it to a user. Obviously, the request for extracting system attribute indicates a query. In other words, the Miyachi technique indicates the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute*; and *using by said reporting application said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method by using query for monitoring condition of system attributes in order to maintain and repair electronic devices in a network.

Regarding to claim 4, Miyachi teaches a method for providing notification of a technician remote from a machine of the need for machine assistance (Miyachi, Col. 3, lines 43-57). As shown in FIG. 1 is a LAN 100 includes a file server 120, workstations 150, printers 180 and a Host 110b coupled to one another via network communications lines 160 (Miyachi, Col. 4, line 38-Col. 5, line 8). As shown in FIG. 2 is a data processing system comprising the MFP 110a (multifunction peripheral), and the Host 110b. The Host 110b is responsible for periodically initiating a refresh of a status information database, which is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in the non-volatile rewritable data storage device 240. (Miyachi, Col. 5, line 9-Col. 8, line 67). As shown in FIG. 4 is a process for retrieving status information of a MFP. After the program has been loaded in step 410, the program allows a technician to select a number of MFP status conditions as shown in Tables 1-2, or the entire database to

Art Unit: 2172

monitor in step 420. In step 425-430, the technician is allowed to designate a notification method and select a number of trigger conditions. Status information is retrieved, and the Host's MFP status database is updated at steps 440-445. If the process is to continue, then the processor 230 analyzes the status information database in step 455, and determines if any of the trigger conditions have been met in step 460 (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 35-Col. 10, line 57). As seen, the program as a reporting application received a number of monitoring status conditions and a trigger condition from a technician as a request for notifying the client the condition of an attribute of MFP, in other words, the technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving a request from a client to notify said client of a condition of an attribute of a system; deriving data about said system attribute to determine if said condition exists*. Miyachi further discloses *attribute is selected from the group consisting of membership of nodes within a cluster, configuration of a cluster, status of a peripheral device, failure of computer hardware, access to local peripherals, addition of shared peripherals, removal of shared peripherals, ownership of a shared peripheral, availability of shared peripherals for addition to a cluster, resilience to faults of a High Availability cluster, performance potential of a cluster, and any combination thereof* (Miyachi, *status of peripheral device, access to local peripherals* as in Col. 5, line 57-Col. 8, line 60), and the steps of *receiving by said reporting application actual data from said system* (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 13-21) and *upon determining that said condition exists, notifying the client of the existence of said condition* by initiating a notification in step 465 as indicated in the settings received in step 425 (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 58-65). Miyachi does not explicitly teach the *request comprises information*

specifying a query for said system attribute; and using said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute. However, as shown in FIG. 4, a technician is allowed to select a number of MFP status conditions to monitor in step 420.

Preferably, the technician may be notified of any of the status conditions in Table 1 and Table 2 of Cols. 6-8, and there is an option to provide the entire database. In step 425 the technician is allowed to designate a notification method. This preferably comprises designating the telephone number of the remote monitoring computer 170, but might also include designating a workstation 150 on the LAN 100 to be notified (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 40-Col. 10, line 50). As seen, a request of notifying of a condition of a system attribute as discussed above comprises information specifying the process of extracting system attribute from a database, monitoring system for existence of condition of attribute and presenting it to a user. Obviously, the request for extracting system attribute indicates a query. In other words, the Miyachi technique indicates the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute; and using said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute.* Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method by using query for monitoring condition of system attributes in order to maintain and repair electronic devices in a network.

Regarding to claim 18, Miyachi teaches a system for providing notification of a technician remote from a machine of the need for machine assistance (Miyachi, Col. 3, lines 43-57). As shown in FIG. 1 is a LAN 100 includes a file server 120, workstations

Art Unit: 2172

150, printers 180 and a Host 110b coupled to one another via network communications lines 160 (Miyachi, Col. 4, line 38-Col. 5, line 8). As shown in FIG. 2 is a data processing system comprising the MFP 110a (multifunction peripheral), and the Host 110b. The MFP 110a includes a non-volatile rewritable data storage device 245 for storage of various information, include information regarding the status of operation of the MFP 110a. The Host 110b is responsible for periodically initiating a refresh of a status information database, which is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in the non-volatile rewritable data storage device 240. (Miyachi, Col. 5, line 9-Col. 8, line 67).

As shown in FIG. 4 is a process for retrieving status information of a MFP. After the program has been loaded in step 410, the program allows a technician to select a number of MFP status conditions as shown in Tables 1-2, or the entire database to monitor in step 420. In step 425-430, the technician is allowed to designate a notification method and select a number of trigger conditions. Status information is retrieved, and the Host's MFP status database is updated at steps 440-445. If the process is to continue, then the processor 230 analyzes the status information database in step 455, and determines if any of the trigger conditions have been met in step 460 (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 35-Col. 10, line 57). Thus, the processor 230 receives a trigger condition from a technician as a request for notifying the client the condition of an attribute of MFP, and the technique as discussed indicates: *means for storing a reporting application; a means for executing said reporting application*; wherein reporting application includes computer executable software code for *receiving from a client a request to notify said client application program of a condition of an attribute of a system; determining if said*

Art Unit: 2172

condition exists. Miyachi further discloses the step of *upon determining that said condition exists, notifies said client of the existence of said condition* by initiating a notification in step 465 as indicated in the settings received in step 425 (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 58-65).

Miyachi does not explicitly disclose the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute*. However, as shown in FIG. 4, a technician is allowed to select a number of MFP status conditions to monitor in step 420. Preferably, the technician may be notified of any of the status conditions in Table 1 and Table 2 of Cols. 6-8, and there is an option to provide the entire database. In step 425 the technician is allowed to designate a notification method. This preferably comprises designating the telephone number of the remote monitoring computer 170, but might also include designating a workstation 150 on the LAN 100 to be notified (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 40-Col. 10, line 50). As seen, a request of notifying of a condition of a system attribute as discussed above comprises information specifying the process of extracting system attribute from a database, monitoring system for existence of condition of attribute and presenting it to a user. Obviously, the request for extracting system attribute indicates a query. In other words, the Miyachi technique indicates the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method by using query for monitoring condition of system attributes in order to maintain and repair electronic devices in a network.

Regarding to claim 2, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1 but fails to disclose the step of *generating derived data based upon the result of said query of said system*. However, according to Miyachi, the client may be notified of any of the status conditions or the entire database after the step of status condition selection (Miyachi, Col. 9, lines 39-46), this implies the step of generating derived data based on the result of selection step. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of generating data based on the result of querying in order to display the result in a predefined format.

Regarding to claims 3, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claims 1, 13, Miyachi further discloses: *condition is a change in said attribute* (Miyachi, Col. 9, lines 55-65).

Regarding to claim 8, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Miyachi further discloses *information specifying a query for said system attribute comprises multiple transactions bracketed together* (Col. 9, line 55-Col. 10, line 21).

Regarding to claims 9, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claims 1, and 13, Miyachi further discloses: *multiple transactions bracketed*

together, wherein upon determining that such bracketed condition exist, notifying said client of the existence of such bracketed conditions (Col. 9, line 55-Col. 10, line 12).

Regarding to claim 10, Miyachi and Sybase teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 9, Miyachi further discloses *the multiple changes are bracketed together, wherein upon determining that such bracketed changes exist, notifying said client of the existence of such bracketed changes* (Col. 9, line 55-Col. 10, line 12).

4. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492] in view of Onaga [USP 6,266,693 B1].

Regarding to claim 5, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose: *client is selected from the group consisting of a user and a client application program*. Onaga teaches a method for monitoring status of multifunction peripherals (Onaga, Col. 1, lines 25-30). Onaga further discloses four classes of users and each of these classes is given access to different classes of peripheral settings and features or *client is selected from the group consisting of a user and a client application program*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of selection of client from the group of a user and a client application program into the Miyachi method in order to control the access of client.

Regarding to claim 11, Miyachi teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but fails to disclose: *client is a graphical user interface (GUI) that displays information to a human user*. Onaga teaches a method for monitoring status of multifunction peripherals (Onaga, Col. 1, lines 25-30). Onaga further discloses *client is a graphical user interface (GUI) that displays information to a human user* (Onaga, FIG. 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method to have a graphical user interface in order to display information to a user.

5. Claims 7, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492] in view of Sybase [Transact-SQL User's Guide, Copyright 1996].

Regarding to claim 7, Miyachi teaches a method for providing notification of a technician remote from a machine of the need for machine assistance (Miyachi, Col. 3, lines 43-57). As shown in FIG. 1 is a LAN 100 includes a file server 120, workstations 150, printers 180 and a Host 110b coupled to one another via network communications lines 160 (Miyachi, Col. 4, line 38-Col. 5, line 8). As shown in FIG. 2 is a data processing system comprising the MFP 110a (multifunction peripheral), and the Host 110b. The Host 110b is responsible for periodically initiating a refresh of a status information database, which is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in the non-volatile rewritable data storage device 240. (Miyachi, Col. 5, line 9-Col. 8, line 67). As shown in FIG. 4 is a process for retrieving status information of a MFP. After the

Art Unit: 2172

program has been loaded in step 410, the program allows a technician to select a number of MFP status conditions as shown in Tables 1-2, or the entire database to monitor in step 420. In step 425-430, the technician is allowed to designate a notification method and select a number of trigger conditions. Status information is retrieved, and the Host's MFP status database is updated at steps 440-445. If the process is to continue, then the processor 230 analyzes the status information database in step 455, and determines if any of the trigger conditions have been met in step 460 (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 35-Col. 10, line 57). As seen, the program as a reporting application received a number of monitoring status conditions and a trigger condition from a technician as a request for notifying the client the condition of an attribute of MFP, in other words, the technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving a request from a client to notify said client of a condition of an attribute of a system; deriving data about said system attribute to determine if said condition exists*. Miyachi further discloses the claimed *upon determining that said condition exists, notifying the client of the existence of said condition* by initiating a notification in step 465 as indicated in the settings received in step 425 (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 58-65). Miyachi does not explicitly teach the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute, wherein said information specifying a query for said system attribute is an SQL query, and wherein said SQL query comprises an SQL view*; and *using by said reporting application said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute*. However, as shown in FIG. 4, a technician is allowed to select a number of MFP status conditions to monitor in step 420. Preferably, the technician may be notified of any of the status

Art Unit: 2172

conditions in Table 1 and Table 2 of Cols. 6-8, and there is an option to provide the entire database. In step 425 the technician is allowed to designate a notification method. This preferably comprises designating the telephone number of the remote monitoring computer 170, but might also include designating a workstation 150 on the LAN 100 to be notified (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 40-Col. 10, line 50). As seen, a request of notifying of a condition of a system attribute as discussed above comprises information specifying the process of extracting system attribute from a database, monitoring system for existence of condition of attribute and presenting it to a user. Obviously, the request for extracting system attribute indicates a query. In other words, the Miyachi technique indicates the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute*; and *using by said reporting application said query for monitoring said system for existence of said condition of said attribute*.

Sybase teaches SQL as a high-level language includes commands for retrieving data from a database, creating database object and other functions (Sybase, Chapter 1: Introduction, Overview). As shown in Chapter 1 is the method of creating SQL statements by using select command. As shown in Chapter 14 is the method of creating trigger conditions by using SQL statements. Sybase further discloses: *SQL query comprises an SQL view* (Sybase, Chapter 8, Views: Limiting access to Data, Creating Views).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method by by using SQL query as taught by Sybase for monitoring condition of system attributes, and by including the

Art Unit: 2172

Sybase technique, a user-friendly system could be provided to the user by defining a trigger condition via either a SQL query or a pre-defined query in order to maintain and repair electronic devices in a network.

Regarding to claim 20, Miyachi and Sybase teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 18, Sybase further discloses the system comprises: *multiple nodes, wherein at least one of said nodes is executing said reporting application* (Miyachi, Fig. 1-2, Col. 4-5).

Regarding to claim 22, Miyachi and Sybase teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 18, Miyachi further discloses the step *of monitoring system to determine if said condition exist* (Miyachi, Col. 5, lines 57-65).

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492] in view of Onaga [USP 6,266,693 B1] and Sybase [Transact-SQL User's Guide, Copyright 1996].

Regarding to claim 12, Miyachi and Onaga teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, but fails to teach the step of *deriving data to determine if a condition of said one or more attributes exists such that the GUI should redraw the graphics displaying said information about said one or more attributes*. Sybase teaches

Art Unit: 2172

retrieving data through views by using SQL, the SQL server checks to make sure that all the database objects exist and create a view that includes all the attributes as indicate in the condition of the query (see Chapter 8, Views, Limiting Access to Data, What are Views?, Retrieving Data through Views). Thus, the Miyachi, and Onaga method can use SQL to implement the step of condition determination and graphic redrawing to make sure the attributes exist and provide a view for these attributes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi and Onaga method by applying SQL to implement the steps of condition determination and graphic redrawing to determine if a condition of one or more attributes exists such that GUI could redraw the graphic displaying.

7. Claims 13, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492] in view of applicant admitted prior art [Background, pages 2-6].

Regarding to claim 13, Miyachi teaches a method for providing notification of a technician remote from a machine of the need for machine assistance (Miyachi, Col. 3, lines 43-57). As shown in FIG. 1 is a LAN 100 includes a file server 120, workstations 150, printers 180 and a Host 110b coupled to one another via network communications lines 160 (Miyachi, Col. 4, line 38-Col. 5, line 8). As shown in FIG. 2 is a data processing system comprising the MFP 110a (multifunction peripheral), and the Host

Art Unit: 2172

110b. The Host 110b is responsible for periodically initiating a refresh of a status information database, which is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in the non-volatile rewritable data storage device 240. (Miyachi, Col. 5, line 9-Col. 8, line 67). As shown in FIG. 4 is a process for retrieving status information of a MFP. After the program has been loaded in step 410, the program allows a technician to select a number of MFP status conditions as shown in Tables 1-2, or the entire database to monitor in step 420. In step 425-430, the technician is allowed to designate a notification method and select a number of trigger conditions. Status information is retrieved, and the Host's MFP status database is updated at steps 440-445. If the process is to continue, then the processor 230 analyzes the status information database in step 455, and determines if any of the trigger conditions have been met in step 460 (Miyachi, Col. 9, line 35-Col. 10, line 57). As seen, the program as a reporting application received a number of monitoring status conditions and a trigger condition from a technician as a request for notifying the client the condition of an attribute of MFP, in other words, the technique as discussed indicates the steps of *receiving from a client a request to notify said client of a condition of an attribute of a system; deriving data about said system attribute, and determining from said derived data if said condition exist*. Miyachi further discloses the claimed *upon determining that said condition exists, notifies said client of the existence of said condition* by initiating a notification in step 465 as indicated in the settings received in step 425 (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 58-65). Miyachi does not explicitly teach the *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute; and querying said system as specified by said request*. Applicant admitted

Art Unit: 2172

prior art teaches an operated application program for investigating and obtaining information about system attributes as a method and reporting application for stimulating notification regarding changes of system attributes (page 2, lines 1-5). The applicant admitted prior art application program can issue commands querying a system, and in response to such commands receive "actual" data (page 3, 21-23). As seen, a *request comprises information specifying a query for said system attribute; and querying said system as specified by said request* for receiving "actual" data was taught by Applicant Admitted Prior Art. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Miyachi method by querying the system in order to obtain the actual data of system for maintaining and repairing electronic devices in a network.

Regarding to claim 16, Miyachi and applicant admitted prior art teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, applicant admitted prior art further discloses *condition is a change in said attribute* (page 2, lines 3-5).

Regarding to claim 21, Miyachi and Applicant Admitted Prior Art teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, Miyachi further discloses the step of *periodically querying the system* (Miyachi, Col. 10, lines 14-21).

8. Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi [USP 6,108,492] in view of applicant admitted prior art and Sybase [SQL serveräTransact-SQL User's Guide].

Regarding to claim 14, Miyachi and applicant admitted prior art teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, applicant admitted prior art further discloses an application program can issue commands querying a system and in response to such commands receive "actual" data (page 3, lines 21-23), but fails to teach *information specifying a query for said system attribute is an SQL query*. Sybase teaches SQL as a high level language for relational database system and using query as a request for retrieval of data by using the select command (Sybase, Chapter 1: Introduction, Overview and Queries, Data Modification). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the applicant admitted prior art method and computer program code by using SQL as a high level language in order to query and retrieve complex information of system attributes.

Regarding to claim 17, Miyachi and applicant admitted prior art teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 13, applicant admitted prior art further discloses an application program can issue commands querying a system and in response to such commands receive "actual" data (page 3, lines 21-23) and the program may itself figure out whether any changes have occurred in the system

Art Unit: 2172

attributes (page 2, lines 3-5). Applicant admitted prior art fails to teaches *multiple conditions bracketed together, wherein upon determining that such bracketed conditions exist, notifying said client of the existence of such bracketed conditions*. Sybase teaches SQL as a high level language for relational database system and using query as a request for retrieval of data by using the select command and information specifying a query comprises multiple transactions bracketed together (Sybase, Chapter 1: Introduction, Overview and Queries, Data Modification, Chapter 2, Queries: Selecting Data From a Table, What are Queries). Thus, multiple changes as the conditions of the system attributes can be queried by bracketing them together for stimulating notification. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the applicant admitted prior art method by including the taught of Sybase of bracketing multiple conditions together in order to query a complex changes as the conditions of system attributes.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q PHAM whose telephone number is 703-605-4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2172

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Examiner Hung Pham
January 5, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alford Kindred', written over a horizontal line.

ALFORD KINDRED
PRIMARY EXAMINER